McCARTHY & HOLTHUS, LLP David C. Scott, Esq. (SBN: 225893) Rachel Opatik, Esq. (SBN: 243140) 1770 Fourth Avenue 2 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 685-4800 3 Facsimile: (619) 685-4811 dscott@mccarthyholthus.com 4 Email: ropatik@mccarthyholthus.com 5 Attorneys for Defendant, Bank of America, N.A. and Quality Loan Service Corp. 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA ED. ROCIO PINEDA. 10 Plaintiff. 11 13 AMENUE LIFORNIA 92101 10 FACSIMILE (619) 685-4810 Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino Superior Court Case No: V. CIVDS 1106684 BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. formally NOTICE OF REMOVAL doing business as GREENPOINT [28 U.S.C. § 1446(d)] MORTGAGE FUNDING; QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORP: 35 16 and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive Defendants. 17 18 TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR 19 THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, AND ALL PARTIES AND 20 21 THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: 22 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, Defendants BANK OF AMERICA N.A. ("BAC") and QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORP. 23 24 ("QUALITY") (collectively, "DEFENDANTS") hereby remove the above 25 captioned action from the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, to the United States District Court for the Central District of California. 26 27 DEFENDANTS are entitled to removal based on federal question jurisdiction, as

follows:

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

///

1

3

5

6

7

8

9

- 1. On May 25, 2011, an action was commenced against Defendant in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino, entitled *Rocio Pineda vs.* Bank of America, N.A., et al. as Case No. CIVDS 1106684. A true and accurate copy of the Complaint in the State Court Action is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."
- This Court has jurisdiction over this matter under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 2. because Plaintiffs' claims arise under the laws of the United States. The Supreme Court has held that "a case 'arose under' federal law where the vindication of a right under state law necessarily turned on some construction of federal law." Franchise Tax Bd. v. Construction Laborers Vacation Trust, 463 U.S. 1, 9 (1983). Plaintiffs allege in their Seventh Cause of Action that DEFENDANTS have violated TILA (Complaint ¶¶ 66-71) Accordingly, this case turns upon federal questions, and this Court has jurisdiction.
- 3. The State Court Action was filed on May 25, 2011. This Notice of Removal is being filed within 30 days of the filing of the Complaint and, thus, within 30 days of the date on which DEFENDANTS could have been served in the State Court Action. Removal, therefore, is timely in accord with 28 U.S.C. §1446(b).
- 4. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a), the Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state and common law claims. It is well-settled that federal district courts have supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims that share a "common nucleus of operative facts" with a Federal claim. City of Chicago v. International College of Surgeons, 522 U.S. 153, 164-65 (1997). Plaintiffs' state and common law claims form part of the same case or controversy and, accordingly, arise out of a common nucleus of operative facts.
- 5. Removal to this district court is proper because this is the district that embraces the county in which Plaintiff filed the state court action. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a).

3

5

- 6. On June 3, 2011, Defendant Quality Loan Service Corporation filed its Declaration of Non-Monetary Status with the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino in response to PLAINTIFFS' Complaint. In addition, Defendant Quality Loan Service Corp. has consented to removal of this matter to federal court.
- As required by 28 U.S.C. §1446(d), Defendant will provide written notice of removal of this action to Plaintiff and the San Bernardino County Superior Court.

### **CONCLUSION**

By this Notice of Removal and the associated attachments, DEFENDANTS do not waive any objections that they may have as to service, jurisdiction or venue, or any other defenses or objections that they may have to this action. DEFENDANTS intend no admission of fact, law or liability by this Notice, and expressly reserve all defenses, motions, and/or pleas.

WHEREFORE, DEFENDANTS pray that the above action now pending against them in the Superior Court of California, County of San Bernardino as Case Number CIVDS1106684 be removed to this Court and that this Court assume jurisdiction over the action and determine it on the merits.

Dated: June 20, 2011	Respectfully submitted,
	McCARTHY & HOLTHUS, LLP

By: /s/ David Scott David C. Scott, Esq. Rachel Opatik, Esq. Attorneys for Defendants, Bank of America, N.A. and Quality Loan Service Corp.

# EXHIBIT A

Cas	e 5:11-cv-00972-PSG-SP Document 1	Filed 06/20/11	Page 5 of 28	Page ID #:8		
1 2 3 4 5 6	ROCIO PINEDA 7946 DRAKE STREET FONTANA, CA 92336 TELEPHONE NO. (562) 965-2034  PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER			LED IOR COURT AN BERNARDINO RIDINO DISTRICT  5 2011  Shullo Deputy		
8	SUPERIOR COURT FOR	R THE STATE (	OF CALIFORN	NA.		
8	IN AND FOR COUN	TY OF SAN BE	RNARDINO			
10			· ·			
11	ROCIO PINEDA ,	CASE NO:	£. <u>*</u>	VDQ 119468.		
12 13	Plaintiff,	COMPLAINT FOR: MONETARY DAMAGES STATUTORY DAMAGES, PUNITIVE				
14	V.	DAMAGES, INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND DECLARATORY RELIEF  1. VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §2923.5;				
15 16	BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. formally doing business as GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING;, QUALITY LOAN SERVICE					
17	CORP;, and DOES 1 through 50 inclusive		NAL MISREPR N OF <i>CALIFOR</i>			
18 19	Defendants.	CODE §292 5. VIOLATIO	3.6; N OF <i>CALIFOR</i>			
20			N OF <i>BUSINES</i>			
21			<i>ONS CODE</i> §172 . TRUTH IN L			
22		ACT;				
23						
24				1		
25	Plaintiff ROCIO PINEDA an (Here	inaner referred a	s "Plaintiff") all	eges nerein as		
26	follows:					
27						
28						

#### GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

- Plaintiff at all times relevant has been a resident of the County of San Bernardino,
   State of California and the owner of Real Property, including but not limited to the
   property at issue herein, 7946 DRAKE STREET, FONTANA, CA 92336.
- 2. Defendant BANK OF AMERICA, N.A. formally doing business as GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING (hereinafter "BOFA") at all times herein mentioned was doing business in the County of San Bernardino, State of California and was one of the original Lender for Plaintiff's Deed of Trust Deed and Note.
- Defendant QUALITY LOAN SERVICE CORP., (hereinafter "QUALITY") at all
  times herein mentioned is doing business in the County of San Bernardino, State of
  California and was listed on the Notice of Default and Notice of Trustee Sale for the
  above named Real Property.
- 4. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 50, inclusive, and therefore sues these defendants by such fictitious names and all persons unknown claiming any legal or equitable right, title, estate, lien, or interest in the property described in the complaint adverse to plaintiff's title, or any cloud on Plaintiff's title thereto. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when ascertained.
- 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all times herein mentioned each of the defendants sued herein was the agent and employee of each of the remaining defendants. Plaintiff alleges that each and every defendant alleged herein ratified the conduct of each and every other defendant. Plaintiff further alleges that at

all times said defendants were was acting within the purpose and scope of such agency and employment.

- 6. Plaintiff financed the foregoing Real Property on or about March 5, 2007 through BOFA, by virtue of a Trust Deed and Notes securing the Loans. (See Exhibit "A")
- 7. Plaintiffs further allege that on or about March 2, 2010 Defendants allege that Plaintiffs became in default of their loan. (See Exhibit "B") However the Declaration of Due Diligence that is required to be attached to the Notice of Default is missing pursuant to California Civil Code §2923.5, therefore making the Notice of Default void.
- 8. Plaintiff further alleges on information and belief that none of these alleged beneficiaries or representatives on the Notice of Default and/or Notice of Trustee's Sale can prove that they have the authority to conduct the foreclosure. Furthermore, the Defendants listed on the Notice of Default and/or Notice of Trustee's Sale were never assigned the rights under this Deed of Trust to conduct a valid foreclosure sale.
- 9. Plaintiff further alleges that the foreclosure sale of the Subject Property due to the failed notices and unauthorized parties was not executed in accordance with the requirements of California Civil Code §2924, §2923.5 and §2923.6.
- 10. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are engaged in and continue to engage in violations of California law including but, not limited to: California Civil Code §2924, §2923.5 and §2923.6, and unless restrained will continue to engage in such misconduct, and that a public benefit necessitates that Defendants be restrained from such conduct in the future.

I.

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §2923.5 (Against all Defendants)

- 11. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges Paragraphs 1 through 10 as though fully set forth berein.
- 12. Defendants cannot prove that the non-judicial foreclosure which has commenced, strictly complied with the tenets of *California Civil Code* §2923.5 and §2924 in order to maintain an action for possession.
- 13. The California Legislature passed Senate Bill 1137, impacting residential mortgage lenders, foreclosure procedures and eviction procedures. This law is effective immediately and extends on to January 1, 2013. The Statute amends provisions of the non-judicial foreclosure procedures found in California Code of Civil Procedure §2924, by adding requirements for meetings, due diligence, and notification of counseling. The primary purpose for the Statute is foreclosure procedures and imposes an unprecedented duty upon lenders relating to contact with borrowers.

#### California Civil Code §2923.5

- 14. As September 6, 2008, California Civil Code §2923.5 applies to loans made from January 1, 2003, to December 31, 2007, and loans secured by residential real property that are for owner-occupied residences. For purposes of California Civil Code §2923.5, "owner-occupied" means that the residence is the principal residence of the borrower. Prior to filing a Notice of Default, California Civil Code §2923.5 provides in pertinent part:
- (a) (1) A trustee may not file a notice of default pursuant to Section 2924 until 30 days after contact is made as required by paragraph (2) or 30 days after satisfying the due diligence requirements as described in subdivision (g). In either case, the borrower shall be provided the toll-free telephone number made available by the United States Department of Housing and Urban

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Development (HUD) to find a HUD-certified housing counseling agency. Any meeting may occur telephonically.

(2) An authorized agent shall contact the borrower in person or by telephone in order to assess the borrower's financial situation and explore options for the borrower to avoid foroclosure. During the initial contact, the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall advise the borrower that he or she has the right to request a subsequent meeting and, if requested, the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall schedule the meeting to occur within 14 days.

Lender in this case did not provide a toll-free telephone number to Plaintiff. Plaintiff was never contacted to assess their financial situation and was not given any options in order to avoid foreclosure. Plaintiff would have requested a meeting at their home within 14 days if they had been advised of that option.

(b) A notice of default filed pursuant to Section 2924 shall include a declaration from the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent that it has contacted the borrower, tried with due diligence to contact the borrower as required by this section, or the borrower has surrendered the property to the mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent.

The required declaration is missing/improper. The declaration does not contain a penalty of perjury clause and there is no evidence on the face of the Notice of Default as to whether the declarant had any personal knowledge concerning any contact made to Plaintiff. (See infra)

(c) If a mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent had already filed the notice of default prior to the enactment of this section and did not subsequently file a notice of rescission, then the mortgagee, trustee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall, as part of the notice of sale filed pursuant to Section 2924f, include a declaration that either:

- (1) States that the borrower was contacted to assess the borrower's financial situation and to explore options for the borrower to avoid foreclosure.
- (2) Lists the efforts made, if any, to contact the borrower in the event no contact was made.

- 15. Furthermore California Civil Code §2923.5(g) provides that a borrower not contacted by a mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent despite "due diligence" shall mean all of the following:
  - (1) A mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall first attempt to contact a borrower by sending a first-class letter that includes the toll-free telephone number made available by HUD to find a HUD-certified housing counseling agency.
  - (2) (A) After the letter has been sent, the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall attempt to contact the borrower by telephone at least three times at different hours and on different days. Telephone calls shall be made to the primary telephone number on file.
  - (B) A mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent may attempt to contact a borrower using an automated system to dial borrowers, provided that, if the telephone call is answered, the call is connected to a live representative of the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent.
  - (C) A mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent satisfies the telephone contact requirements of this paragraph if it determines, after attempting contact pursuant to this paragraph, that the borrower's primary telephone number and secondary telephone number or numbers on file, if any, have been disconnected.
  - (3) If the borrower does not respond within two weeks after the telephone call requirements of paragraph (2) have been satisfied, the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall then send a certified letter, with return receipt requested.
  - (4) The mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent shall provide a means for the borrower to contact it in a timely manner, including a toll-free telephone number that will provide access to a live representative during business hours.

The mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent never complied with the provisions of §2923.5(g) of California Civil Code in its entirety as proscribed.

16. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that the Notice of Default was invalid and unenforceable due to the intentional and willful violations including but, not limited to failing and/or refusing to mail the Notice of Default within ten business days to Plaintiffs, to post and mail the Notice of Default within one month, to properly

set the sale date, to publish the Notice of Sale twenty days prior to the date set for sale, and to record the Notice of Sale as required by *California Civil Code* §2924.

17. Defendants did not fully comply with California Civil Code §2923.5 and therefore the Notice of Default is VOID. Thus if the property is sold in a non-judicial foreclosure, the procedure is void.

# Invalid Declaration on Notice of Default and/or Notice of Trustee's Sale PENALTY OF PERJURY

- 18. The purpose of permitting a declaration under penalty of perjury, in lieu of a sworn statement, is to help ensure that declarations contain a truthful factual representation and are made in good faith. (<u>In re Marriage of Reese & Guy</u>, 73 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> 1214, 87 Cal. Rptr. 2d 339 (4<sup>th</sup> Dist. 1999).
- 19. In addition to California Civil Code §2923.5, California Code of Civil Procedure §2015.5 states:

Whenever, under any law of this state or under any rule, regulation, order or requirement made pursuant to the law of this state, any matter is required or permitted to be supported, evidenced, established, or proved by the sworn statement, declaration, verification, certificate, oath, or affidavit, in writing of the person making the same, such matter may with like force and effect be supported, evidenced, established or proved by the unsworn statement, declaration, verification, or certificate, in writing of such person which recites that is certified or declared by him or her to be true under penalty of perjury, is subscribed by him or her, and (1), if executed within this state, states the date and place of execution; (2) if executed at any place, within or without this state, states the date of execution and that is so certified or declared under the laws of the State of California. The certification or declaration must be in substantially the following form:

(a) If executed within this state:

"I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct":

(Date and Place)	(Signature)

For our purposes we need not look any farther than the Notice of Default to find the declaration is missing and therefore there is no signature under penalty of perjury; as mandated by new Civil Code §2923.5(c). Therefore, the Notice of Default is VOID.

## LACK OF PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE OF DECLARANT

- 20. An affidavit on behalf of a corporation must show that it was made by an authorized officer or agent, and the officer him or herself must swear to the facts. Furthermore, a person who verified a pleading is required to have personal knowledge or reasonable cause to believe the existence of the facts stated therein. Here, the Declaration for the Notice of Default by the agent does not state if the agent has personal knowledge and how he obtained this knowledge.
- 21. The proper function of an affidavit is to state facts, not conclusions, and affidavits that merely state conclusions rather than facts are insufficient. An affidavit must set forth facts and show affirmatively how the affiant obtained personal knowledge of those facts. The Notice of Default does not have the required agent's personal knowledge of facts and if the Plaintiff borrower was affirmatively contacted in person or by telephone to assess the Plaintiff's financial situation and explore options for the Plaintiff to avoid foreclosure. Simply put, the declaration was missing all together.
- 22. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, willfully, wrongfully and without justification, and without privilege have threatened to commence an invalid foreclosure

27. Plaintiff has recently learn

sale against the Plaintiff's SUBJECT PROPERTY, thereby, slandering Plaintiff's title thereto.

- 23. Furthermore, The California Foreclosure Prevention Act, which became effective June 15, 2009, delays the non-judicial foreclosure process by requiring an addition 90-day delay (beyond the current three-month period) between recording a notice of default and a notice of stay for certain residential properties. The law applies to:
  - 1. Loans recorded between January 1, 2003 and January 1, 2008, inclusive,
  - 2. The borrower occupies the property as his/her principal residence and occupied it at the time the loan became delinquent;
  - 3. A notice of default has been recorded on the property; and
  - 4. The loan is secured by a first lien on residential property that is located in California.
- 24. In this case, Plaintiff's property was her principal place of residence and her deed was dated on March 5, 2007. Therefore, the California Foreclosure Prevention Action applies and they should be allowed an additional 90 days (plus the three-month period already) after Notice of Default is recorded.

## II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION <u>FOR FRAUD</u> (Against all Defendants)

- 25. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges Paragraphs 1 through 24 as though fully set forth herein.
- 26. On or about March 5, 2007, Plaintiff obtained a loan through BOFA, to finance her home. (See Exhibit "A"). On or about March 2, 2010, Defendant QUALITY purported to execute a Notice of Default.
- 27. Plaintiff has recently learned that Defendant QUALITY listed on the Notice of Default

and Notice of Trustee's Sale are not the legal owners of the Note and Deed of Trust and were not at the time they will issue the notices and commenced the foreclosure process, notwithstanding the fact that the note was not negotiable and did not contain a valid power of sale and also was void due to the missing/invalid Declaration of Due Diligence.

- 28. The Note executed by Plaintiff was no longer a negotiable instrument because the assignment was not physically applied to the Note pursuant to the holding of <u>Pribus v. Bush</u>, (1981) 118 Cal.App.3d 1003, 173 Cal.Rptr. 747, although there was sufficient room on the back of the Note to complete the assignment, and as such the foreclosure of Plaintiff's subject property was void.
- 29. In addition, California Civil Code §2932.5 governs the Power of sale under an assigned mortgage, and provides that the power of sale can only vest in a person entitled to money payments:
  - "Where a power to sell real property is given to a mortgagee, or other encumbrancer, in an instrument intended to secure the payment of money, the power is part of the security and vests in any person who by assignment becomes entitled to payment of the money secured by the instrument. The power of sale may be exercised by the assignee if the assignment is duly acknowledged and recorded."
- 30. Defendants have no standing to enforce a non-judicial foreclosure. Defendants are strangers to this transaction, and have no authority to go forward with the foreclosure and Trustee's Sale because an assignment was not acknowledge or recorded.
- 31. Uniform Commercial Code §3-301 states that the "person entitled to enforce an instrument" is either the holder of the instrument or a non-holder in possession of the

- instrument who has the rights of a holder. Furthermore, §3-302 states that a "holder in due course" is not a person who acquired rights of an instrument by legal process or by purchase in an execution, bankruptcy, or creditor's sale or similar proceedings.
- 32. Plaintiff executed a Promissory Note (hereinafter the "Note") and a Deed of Trust to BOFA (See Exhibit "A"). GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING and or Defendant BOFA is the Lender and only party entitled to enforce the Note and any security interest with it.
- 33. Defendant QUALITY is not listed anywhere in the Deed of Trust or Promissory Note.

  (See Exhibit "A")
- 34. The San Bernardino Recorder's Office does not contain any evidence of a recorded assignment from GREENPOINT MORTGAGE FUNDING and or BOFA.
- 35. As a result, the power of sale may not be exercised by any of the Defendants since there was never an acknowledged and recorded assignment pursuant to *California Civil Code* §2932.5. Furthermore, Defendant QUALITY has no lawful security interest in the subject property.
- 36. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants, and each of them, falsely misrepresented that the Notice of Default was validly executed, that they intended to induce Plaintiffs into relying on the misrepresentation, that they knew at the time they made these representations to Plaintiffs that they were untrue, and defendants know at the time that they were attempting to foreclose on Plaintiffs' Trust Deeds and notes that they had no right to do so.
- 37. Plaintiff alleges that due to their reliance on Defendants representations he has been damaged in an amount that currently exceeds \$25,000.00 and additionally costs of

moving out of Plaintiffs' property and the costs to relocate back to the subject Property.

- 38. Plaintiff alleges Defendants BOFA and QUALITY intentionally and fraudulently converted Plaintiffs' right, title and interest to his property, and any equity therein.

  Defendants' willful deceit was with intent to induce Plaintiff into believing they had authority to start the foreclosure process by recording a false document. (See infra)
- 39. Defendants' conduct as set forth above was intentional, oppressive fraudulent and malicious so as to justify an award of punitive damages in an amount sufficient that such conduct will not be repeated.

### Recording a False Document

40. The Notice of Default states, "That by reason thereof, the present beneficiary under such deed of trust, has executed and delivered to said agent, a written Declaration of Default and Demand for same, and has deposited with said agent such Deed of Trust and all documents evidencing obligations secured thereby"

However, Defendants do not have the original promissory note, nor do they provide any documents evidencing obligations secured thereby.

- 41. Furthermore, according to California Penal Code §115 in pertinent part:
  - (a) Every person who knowingly procures or offers any false or forged instrument to be filed, registered, or recorded in any public office within this state, which instrument, if genuine, might be filed, registered, or recorded under any law of this state or of the United States, is guilty of a felony.
  - (b) Each instrument which is procured or offered to be filed, registered, or recorded in violation of subdivision (a) shall constitute a separate violation of this section.

In addition, California Evidence Code §669 states in pertinent part:

- (a) The failure of a person to exercise due care is presumed if:
- (1) He violated a statute, ordinance, or regulation of a public entity;

Here, as stated above the Declaration of Due Diligence as required by Section 2923.5 of the California Civil Code is missing and/or improper for the Notice of Default. Therefore, Defendants BOFA and QUALITY, is guilty of a felony for

recording the Notice of Default with a false instrument according to California Penal Code §115. Since Defendants have violated a statute, the failure of them to exercise due care will be presumed.

42. Furthermore, This defendant did not adhere to the mandates laid out by congress before a foreclosure can be considered duly perfected. The Notice of Default states:

"That by reason thereof, the present beneficiary under such deed of trust, has executed and delivered to said agent, a written Declaration of Default and Demand for same, and has deposited with said agent such Deed of Trust and all documents evidencing obligations secured thereby, and has declared and does hereby declare all sums secured thereby immediately due and payable and has elected and does hereby elect to cause the trust property to be sold to satisfy the obligations secured thereby."

However, Defendants do not have the Deed of Trust, nor do they provide any documents evidencing obligations secured thereby. For the aforementioned reasons, the Notice of Default will be void as a matter of law and Defendants recorded a false document.

#### III.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION FOR INTENTIONAL MISREPRESENTATION (Against all Defendants)

- 43. Plaintiff repeats and re-alleges Paragraphs 1 through 42 as though fully set forth herein.
- 44. Plaintiff is informed and believe that the representation on the Deed of Trust and

  Notice of Default was a false intentional representation in the following particulars:
  - [A] Defendant BOFA knew Defendant QUALITY was not authorized to commence the foreclosure process by executing a Notice of Default and it was made for the sole purpose of inducing reliance and confusing Plaintiffs.
    - [B] At the time Defendant QUALITY executed the Notice of Default they knew

the required Declaration of Due Diligence was false and for the sole purpose of inducing reliance and confusing Plaintiffs. Defendants also recorded a document they knew was false.

[C] Defendant QUALITY was not entitled to the payments and authorized to start the foreclosure process since there was never a recorded assignment from.

#### IV.

# FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE §2923.6 (As Against All Defendants)

- 45. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs 1 through 44 as though set forth fully herein.
- 46. Defendants' Pooling and Servicing Agreement (hereinafter "PSA") contains a duty to maximize net present value to its investors and related parties.
- 47. California Civil Code §2923.6 broadens and extends this PSA duty by providing that the mortgagee, beneficiary, or authorized agent offer the borrower a loan modification or workout plan if such a modification or plan is consistent with its contractual or other authority.
- 48. Pursuant to California Civil Code §2923.6(a), a servicer acts in the best interest of all parties if it agrees to or implements a loan modification where the (1) loan is in payment default, and (2) anticipated recovery under the loan modification or workout plan exceeds the anticipated recovery through foreclosure on a net present value basis.
- 49. Plaintiff's loan is presently in an uncertain state and The Joint Economic Committee of Congress estimated in June 2007 that the average foreclosure results in \$77, 935.00 in costs to the homeowner, lender, local government, and neighbors.

- 50. Of the \$77,935.00 in foreclosure costs, the Joint Economic Committee of Congress estimates that the lender will suffer \$50,000.00 in costs in conducting a non-judicial foreclosure on the property, maintaining, rehabilitating, insuring, and reselling the property to a third party. Freddie Mac places this loss higher at \$58,759.00.
- 51. Pursuant to California Civil Code §2823.6, Plaintiffs invoke the remedies embodied in the aforementioned agreement and/or codes with a willingness to execute a modification of their loan. This option was not explored with the Plaintiffs.
- 52. Furthermore, according to Anthony E. Dimock v. Emerald Properties, LLC. et al. (81 Cal.App.4th 868, 97 Cal.Rptr.2d 255), Plaintiff was not required to rely upon equity in attacking the deed and therefore he was not required to meet any of the burdens imposed when, as a matter of equity, a party wishes to set aside a voidable deed. (See Little v. CFS Service Corp., supra, 188 Cal.App.3d at p. 1359.) In particular, Plaintiff is not required to tender any of the amounts due under the note.
- 53. Also in Scott v. Security Title Ins. & Guar. Co. (1937) 9 Cal.2d 606, 610-611, the court stated that "It is true that if the sale had been totally void their tender obligation would have been excused." A "void sale" according to 12 Thompson on Real Estate, Thomas Editions §101.0(c)(2)(i) can be set aside even though the property passed into the hands of a bona fide purchaser. Furthermore, the section states that most of the cases in which a sale to a bona fide purchaser was set aside involved sales by trustees or mortgagees who lacked the power to sell.
- 54. Plaintiff is suing for a legal remedy and therefore, there is no requirement of tender. In addition the lack of power of sale rendered the sale void which would excuse Plaintiff's tender obligation.

# 

## 

### 

# 

### 

#### 

## 

### ...

## 

# 

#### V.

# FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION <u>VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE</u> §1572 (As to All Defendants)

- 55. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the above paragraphs 1 through 54 as though set forth fully herein.
- 56. Plaintiff is an unsophisticated customer whose reliance upon Defendants was reasonable and consistent with the Congressional intent and purpose of California Civil Code §1572 enacted in 1872 and designed to assist and protect consumers similarly situated as Plaintiff in this action.
- 57. Defendants' misrepresentations, failures to disclose, and failure to assign as described above were made with the intent to induce Plaintiff to obligate himself in reliance on the integrity of Defendants and/or Defendants' predecessors.
- 58. As an unsophisticated customer, Plaintiffs could not have discovered the true nature of the material facts on their own.
- 59. Plaintiff was ignorant of the facts which Defendants misrepresented and failed to disclose and their reliance was a substantial factor in causing their harm.
- 60. As a proximate result of Defendants, Plaintiff has suffered damage in an amount to be determined at trial.
- 61. The conduct of Defendants as mentioned above was fraudulent within the meaning of California Civil Code §3294(c)(3), and by virtue thereof Plaintiff is entitled to an award of punitive damages in an amount sufficient to punish and make an example of the Defendants.

#### VI.

#### SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

**7** 

# VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE §17200 (As Against All Defendants)

- 62. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.
- 63. Plaintiff allege that Defendants' practices are likely to mislead the general public, and therefore, constitute a fraudulent business act of practice within the meaning of *Business and Professions Code* §17200. The Defendants' unfair, unlawful, and fraudulent business practices and false and misleading declaration on the Notice of Default present a continuing threat to members of public in that other consumers will be defrauded into assuming this void Notice of Default is in fact valid. Plaintiffs and other members of the general public have no other adequate remedy of law.
- 64. Plaintiff alleges that the employees and/or agents of Defendant QUALITY represented that said employees and/or agents had contacted Plaintiff to assess his situation. Defendants recorded a false document known as the Notice of Default with an invalid Declaration. Furthermore, there was never an assignment from Defendants BOFA to QUALITY. Therefore, the Notice of Default is VOID as a matter of law.
- 65. The harm to Plaintiff and to members of the general public outweighs the utility of Defendants' policy and practices, consequently, constitute an unlawful business act of practice within the meaning of *Business and Professions Code* §17200.

As a result of the aforementioned acts, Plaintiff has lost money or property and suffered injury in fact. Defendants received and continue to hold Plaintiff's money and other members of the public who fell victim to Defendants' scheme.

g

#### VII

#### SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

### VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL TRUTH IN LENDING ACT

(Against Defendants BOFA)

- 66. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 65, inclusive, as though set forth fully herein.
- 69. Defendants failed to include and disclose certain charges in the finance charge shown on the TIL statement, which charges were imposed on Plaintiffs incident to the extension of credit to the Plaintiffs and were required to be disclosed pursuant to 15 USC sec. 1605 and Regulation Z sec. 226.4, thus resulting in an improper disclosure of finance charges in violation of 15 USC sec. 1601 et seq., Regulation Z sec. 226.18(d). Such undisclosed charges include a sum identified on the Settlement Statement listing the amount financed which is different from the sum listed on the original Note.
- By calculating the annual percentage rate ("APR") based upon improperly calculated and disclosed amounts, Defendants are in violation of 15 USC sec. 1601 et seq., Regulation Z sec. 226.18(c), 18(d) and 22.
- 71. Defendants' failure to provide the required disclosures provides Plaintiff's with the right to rescind the transaction, and Plaintiffs, through this public Complaint which is intended to be construed, for purposes of this claim, as a form Notice of Rescission, hereby elect to rescind the transaction.

The aforementioned acts of Defendants, and each of them, were motivated by oppression, fraud, malice in that Defendants, and each of them, by their respective acts, omissions, nonfeasance, misfeasance and/or malfeasance executed an invalid

19 20

21 22

23 24

25

26

27 28 foreclosure sale of the Plaintiff's Subject Property, in order to deny Plaintiff of his rights of possession and ownership, whereupon, the Foreclosure was defective as discussed above due to the VOID Notice of Default and as such the Property must be restored to Plaintiff or alternatively Plaintiff is entitled to the value of thereof.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs having set forth the claims for relief against Defendants, respectfully prays that this Court grant the following relief against the Defendants:

- 1. Actual Economic and Non-Economic Damages;
- For a declaration of the rights and duties of the parties relative to Plaintiff's Home 2. to determine the actual status and validity of the loan, Deed of Trust, and Notice of Default.
- For a preliminary injunction and permanent injunction enjoining all Defendants, 3. their agents, assigns, and all person acting under, for, or in concert with them, from foreclosing on Plaintiff's Home or from conducting a trustee's sale or causing a trustee's sale to be conducted relative to Plaintiff's Home:
- Cancellation of any future sale and restitution of the home to the Plaintiffs; 4.
- 5. For damages as provided by statute;
- For an Order enjoining Defendants from continuing to violate the statutes alleged 6. herein;
- 7. For a restraining order preventing Defendants and his, hers, or its agents, employees, officers, attorneys, and representatives from engaging in or performing any of the following acts: (i) offering, or advertising this property for sale and (ii) attempting to transfer title to this property and or (iii) holding any auction therefore;
- 8. For punitive damages;

**VERIFICATION** 

I, Rocio Pineda, am the Plaintiff in the above entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, expect as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing true and correct and that this declaration was executed in Riverside, County of Riverside, State of California.

Dated: 05/25/2011

Rocio Pineda, Declarant

COMPLAINT

. \_

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

#### NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Virginia A. Phillips and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Sheri Pym.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

EDCV11- 972 VAP (SPx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motion	s should be noticed on the calendar	of the Magistrate Judge
==========		========
	NOTICE TO COUNSEL	
A copy of this notice must be served filed, a copy of this notice must be se	with the summons and complaint on all de rved on all plaintiffs).	fendants (if a removal action is
Subsequent documents must be filed	l at the following location:	
Western Division 312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8 Los Angeles, CA 90012	Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516	[X] Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501
Eailure to file at the proper location will re	sult in your documents being returned to you	

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check be Rocio Pineda	f (1)	DEFENDANTS Banks of America, N.A, formally doing business as Greenpoint Mortgage Funding; Quality Loan Service Corp; and Does 1-50			
yourself, provide same.) Rocio Pineda	ddress and Telephone Number. Ii 7946 Drake Street Fontana, CA 92336	f you are representing	Attorneys (If Known)  David C. Scott, Esq. (619) 685-4800  Attorney for  Bank of America, N.A.	s; Quality Loan Serv	McCarthy & Holthus, LLP 1440 Fourth Avenue ice San Diego CA 92101
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTIO	N (Place an X in one box only.)		NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL I		
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	✓ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Part		is State		porated or Principal Place
□ 2 U.S. Government Defendan	of Parties in Item III)			of Bu	porated and Principal Place 5 5 5 siness in Another State
IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in on  ☐ 1 Original	ed from   3 Remanded from		oject of a Foreign Country  3 5 Transferred from another		gn Nation
28 U.S.C. § 1331 - Plaintif  VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place  OTHER STATUTES***  400 State Reapportionment  410 Antitrust  430 Banks and Banking  450 Commerce/ICC  Rates/etc.  460 Deportation  470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt  Organizations  480 Consumer Credit  490 Cable/Sat TV  810 Selective Service  850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange  875 Customer Challenge 12  USC 3410  890 Other Statutory Actions  891 Agricultural Act  892 Economic Stabilization  Act	fs' claims arise under the laws of e an X in one box only.)  GONTRACT  Ito Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loan (Excl. Veterans)		PERSONAL PROPERTY  act   370 Other Fraud   371 Truth in Lend   380 Other Persons Property Dam Product Liabi   BANKRUPICY   422 Appeal 28 US   158   423 Withdrawal 2: USC 157   CIVIL RIGHTS    441 Voting   442 Employment   443 Housing/Accommodations   444 Welfare	RRISON PETUTIC    510 Motion Vacate Habeas   535 Death Page   540 Mandar   555 Prison College   610 Agricult   620 Other Forug   625 Drug Re   625 Seizure Property   881	T10   Fair Labor Standards
☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Info. Act ☐ 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice	□210 Land Condemnation □210 Foreclosure □230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □240 Torts to Land □245 Tort Product Liability □290 All Other Real Property	Liability IMMIGRATION	Employment  446 American with Disabilities - Other  440 Other Civil	☐ 650 Airline I	Regs ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ional ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))
State Statutes	230 All Other Rear Property-	465 Other Immigrat Actions			USC 7609

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number:

ED CV 11 - 00972

VAP (SB)

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

Page 1 of 2

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES If yes, list case number(s):	S: Has this action been p	previously filed in this court of	and dismissed, remanded or closed? (S/No 🗆 Yes	·	
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: If yes, list case number(s):	Have any cases been p	reviously filed in this court th	nat are related to the present case? INO Yes		
C	A. Arise from the san     B. Call for determina     C. For other reasons     D. Involve the same p	ne or closely related transactition of the same or substantia would entail substantial dupli watent, trademark or copyrigh	ally related or similar questions of law and fact; or ication of labor if heard by different judges; or at any one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.	·	
IX. VENUE: (When completing  (a) List the County in this Dist	rict: California County	outside of this District; State	if necessary.)  if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named pl fthis box is checked, go to item (b).	laintiff resides.	
Check here if the government County in this District:  San Bernardino	ent, its agencies or empl	byces is a named plantin. If	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California;	or Foreign Country	
San Bernardino					
b) List the County in this Dist  Check here if the government	rict; California County ent, its agencies or empl	outside of this District; State oyees is a named defendant.	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named do If this box is checked, go to item (c).	:fendant resides.	
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California;	or Foreign Country	
			Bank of America, N.A Texas; Quality Loan Service Corp San Diego County		
San Bernardino Los Angeles, Orange, San Be	rnardino, Riverside, V	'entura <del>, Santa B</del> arbera or S	San)Luis Obispo Counties		
iote: In land condemnation case		e tract of land involved	(/20/4	·	
or other papers as required b	The CV-71 (JS-44) C	ved by the Judicial Conference	rmation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and se the of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local R ting the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate i	tule 3-1 is not filed	
ey to Statistical codes relating t	•				
Nature of Suit Co	de Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of Cause of Action  All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended.  Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))			
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)			
863	DIWC		workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Sec iled for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g		
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows Act, as amended. (42 U.S.	s or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the C. 405(g))	Social Security	
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.			
865	RSI •	All claims for retirement (o U.S.C. (g))	old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act,	as amended. (42	
V-71 (05/08)		CIVILO	OVER SHEET	Page 2 of 2	